

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-27, 29, 32, 33, 35-44, 48 and 49 are currently pending
- Claim 48 is canceled herein
- Claims 1, 33 and 49 are amended herein

[0003] Claim 1 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 48. Claim 49 has been amended to change dependency from herein canceled claim 48 to that of independent claim 1.

[0004] Claim 33 is amended to clarify that “a synchronizing module [is] operatively associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials when the event handler receives **a plurality of unique event notifications** and if the local and remote credentials are different from one another.” Support for the clarifying amendments to claim 33 can be found at least at previously presented claim 48 (canceled herein) and FIG. 6 of the original specification. As such, the amendments to independent claim 33 do not constitute new subject matter.

Cited Documents

[0005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Burch:** Burch et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0171872
- **Brovick:** Brovick et al., “WINDOWS® 2000 Active directory™”

- **Rao:** Rao et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,689,706
- **Heinrich:** Heinrich et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,510,522
- **Yianilos:** Yianilos et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029214

Claims 1-2, 4-16, 33, 35-44 and 48-49 Are Non-Obvious over Burch in view of Brovick and in further view of Rao

[0006] Claims 1-2, 4-16, 33, 35-44 and 48-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Burch further in view of Brovick and further in view of Rao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0007] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 1 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Burch, Brovick and Rao. Applicant submits that the combination of Burch, Brovick and Rao does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

according to the instructions being executed:

enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving **a first event notification**, wherein the first event notification comprises a lock event

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a second event notification**, wherein the second event notification is different from the first event notification and comprises a startup event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a third event notification**, wherein the

third event notification is different from the first and second event notifications and comprises a shutdown event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a fourth event notification**, wherein the fourth event notification is different from the first, second, and third event notifications and comprises a logon event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a fifth event notification**, wherein the fifth event notification is different from the first, second, third, and fourth event notifications and comprises a logoff event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a sixth event notification**, wherein the sixth event notification is different from the first, second third, fourth, and fifth even notifications and comprises a unlock event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a seventh event notification**, wherein the seventh event notification is different from the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth event notifications and comprises a session event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **an eighth event notification**, wherein the eighth event notification is different from the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh event notifications and comprises a timer event;

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a ninth event notification**, wherein the ninth event notification is different from the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth event notifications and comprises a manual request; and

enumerating the local credentials and the remote credentials in response to receiving **a tenth event notification**, wherein the

tenth event notification is different from the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth event notifications and comprises a credential update event;

[0008] Claim 1 as amended recites in part that the local and remote credentials are enumerated in response to a plurality of event notifications, wherein the event notifications comprise: (1) a start up event, (2) a shutdown event, (3) a logon event, (4) a logoff event, (5) an unlock event, (6) a timer event, (7) a manual request and (8) a credential update event. The Office takes unofficial Official Notice that these events are known events that can trigger synchronization. (Office Action, pages 8-9.) Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's assertion that these elements were well known in the art.

[0009] While the Office Action provides a blanket rejection that includes elements of claim 1, the Office Action fails to address claim 1 with specificity. In other words, the Office Action does not cite any references (alone or in combination) that disclose all of the elements of claim 1 and in their particular claimed arrangement. Since the Office has provided little or no reasoning for its rejections, Applicant can do little more than gainsay. Applicant is forced to make assumptions as to the Office's specific reasoning. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Office has denied Applicant a right to adequately and effectively respond to the Office's rejections.

[0010] In *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (CA FC 2002), the Federal Circuit explained the following on page 1433:

The Administrative Procedure Act, which governs the proceedings of administrative agencies [such as the Patent and Trademark Office] and related judicial review, establishes a scheme of "reasoned

decisionmaking.” Not only must an agency's decreed result be within the scope of its lawful authority, but the process by which it reaches that result must be logical and rational. Allentown Mack Sales and Service, Inc. v. National Labor Relations Bd., 522 U.S. 359, 374 (1998) (citation omitted).

This standard requires that the agency not only have reached a sound decision, but have articulated the reasons for that decision. The reviewing court is thus enabled to perform meaningful review within the strictures of the APA, for the court will have a basis on which to determine “whether the decision was based on the relevant factors and whether there has been a clear error of judgment.” Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402, 416 (1971). [emphasis added]

[0011] Applicant submits that the Office has not articulated the reasons for its decision-making in the present Office Action. Furthermore, according to the reasons and facts given above and to 37 CFR § 1.113 and MPEP 706.07, Applicant respectfully submits that no clear issues has been developed between the applicant and the examiner for each pending claim so that such issues would be ready for appeal.

[0012] Beyond the Office's failure to address each element previously enumerated, the Office further fails to address the element that the local credentials and the remote credentials are enumerated responsive to receiving a plurality of event notifications (specifically ten event notifications as presently claimed). The office points to Burch, paragraph [0043] as teaching receiving a first event notification. (See Action, page 3). Burch, paragraph [0043] states:

Now suppose that the principal logs off of or terminates communication with the identity service for some extended period of time and then at a later time re-establishes communication with the identity service. The principal will have a principal credential store which may or

may not have been modified during the lapse of non communication, and in a similar manner one or more records that were previously associated with an active enterprise credential store may have changed during the period of non communication within one or more affected identity stores.

[0013] Applicant respectfully traverses that Burch teaches or suggests receiving a first event notification, but in an attempt to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the local credentials and the remote credentials are enumerated responsive to a plurality of event notifications. Further, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the event notifications that illicit the enumeration are each different event notifications. Burch, paragraph [0044], teaches that “the identity service can automatically generate a new up-to-date instance of a needed enterprise credential store and synchronize with any modified principal credential store via the principal's local synchronization policy which the principal communicates during initial re-communication to the identity service,” but fails to suggest that the local credentials and the remote credentials are enumerated responsive to a plurality of event notifications as presently claimed. Burch simply states that after a user has been logged off long enough, the assumption is that the credential stores will need to be updated. (See Burch, paragraph [0043]).

[0014] Consequently, the combination of Burch, Brovick and Rao does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-16 and 49

[0015] Claims 2-16 and 49 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-16 and 49 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 33

[0016] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 33 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Burch, Brovick and Rao. Applicant submits that the combination of Burch, Brovick and Rao does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

33. (Currently Amended) A system comprising:
an event handler to receive event notifications; and
a synchronizing module operatively associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials when the event handler **receives a plurality of unique event notifications** and if the local and remote credentials are different from one another.

[0017] Applicant respectfully traverses that Burch teaches or suggests “a synchronizing module operatively associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials when the event handler **receives a plurality of unique event notifications** and if the local and remote credentials are different from one another”. Burch, paragraph [0044], teaches that “the identity service can automatically generate a new up-to-date instance of a needed enterprise credential

store and synchronize with any modified principal credential store via the principal's local synchronization policy which the principal communicates during initial re-communication to the identity service,” but fails to suggest that the local credentials and the remote credentials are enumerated responsive to a plurality of unique event notifications as presently claimed.

[0018] Consequently, the combination of Burch, Brovick and Rao does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 35-44

[0019] Claims 35-44 ultimately depend from independent claim 33. As discussed above, claim 33 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 35-44 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 17, 18, 20-27, 29 and 32 Are Non-Obvious over Burch in view of Brovick and in further in view of Heinrich

[0020] Claims 17, 18, 20-27, 29 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Burch further in view of Brovick and further in view of Heinrich. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 17

[0021] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 17 is obvious in view of the combination of Burch, Brovick and Heinrich. Applicant submits that the combination of Burch, Brovick and Heinrich does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

handling errors, wherein error handling comprises returning a write state indication of a status of a credential write operation, wherein the write state indication consists of one of the following:

a none indication, wherein the none indication comprises an indication that the credential was not altered;

a partial indication, wherein the partial indication comprises an indication that the credential was partially altered; or

a done indication, wherein the done indication comprises an indication that the credential was successfully changed.

[0022] The Office again unofficially takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the inventions would have known to include the cited elements and features as presently recited. (Office Action, pages 12-13.) Applicant respectfully traverses the casually utilization of Official Notice as it forces Applicant to gainsay the reasoning for rejection.

[0023] Further, the Office has failed to address the situation wherein the write state indication consists of “**a partial indication**, wherein the partial indication comprises an indication that the credential was partially altered” as presently claimed by independent claim 1. The Office states “it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have employed ACKs and NACKs of **successful**

completion of synchronization.” The Office fails to address the situation wherein the write state indication consists of a “partial indication, wherein the partial indication comprises an indication that the credential was partially altered.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to provide a pinpoint citation of a reference or combination of references that teach or suggest “a partial indication, wherein the partial indication comprises an indication that the credential was partially altered.”

[0024] Consequently, the combination of Burch, Brovick and Heinrich does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 18-27, 29 and 32

[0025] Claims 18-27, 29 and 32 ultimately depend from independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 18-27, 29 and 32 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0026] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative
before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/

Dated: 2010-02-23

Jason F. Lindh
(jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090

Damon J. Kruger
(damonk@leehayes.com; 206-876-6018)
Registration No. 60400